REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

No claims are currently being added, canceled or amended.

A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

Claims 1-14 remain pending in this application.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0191572 to Weinstein et al. in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2007/0192870 to Lynn et al. This rejection is traversed for at least the reasons given below.

In its rejection of presently pending independent claims 1, 7 and 13, the Office Action correctly recognizes that Weinstein et al. does not teach using a processing method unique to each user, and each user is discriminated based on data of the processed parts such that none of the users is capable of intercepting payload data of any of other users currently accessing the predetermined access point. However, the Office Action incorrectly asserts that Lynn teaches such features by introducing randomized payloads, as described in paragraph 0133 and the Abstract of Lynn.

In particular, claim 1 recites that payload processing is executed using a processing method <u>unique to each user</u>. While Lynn describes a system in which random frames are placed into a data stream so that an encryption pattern becomes undetectable, as described in paragraph 0133 of Lynn, this insertion of random frames is based on a processing method that is the same for each user, whereby the only different is the random placement of frames into a data stream. The random placement of frames does not change the fact that each user in the system of Lynn uses the same processing method.

Accordingly, presently pending independent claims 1, 7 and 13 are patentable over the combined teachings of Weinstein and Lynn.

Furthermore, dependent claim 14 recites a step of determining which ones of the plurality of data processing methods are currently not assigned to any of the users and are thus available for assignment to the new user, as available data processing methods; and claim 14 also recites a step of randomly assigning one of the available data processing methods to the new user.

In Lynn, in contrast, the same processing method is used for all users, whereby the only difference is the random selection of data frames to include in the data stream. In Lynn, there is no checking of any data processing methods that are not being currently used by other users, whereby a new user may be assigned the same random data frame at the exact same location as another user who is currently using the system, which is a situation that could not occur in the invention according to claim 14.

Therefore, dependent claim 14 is patentable over the cited art of record for these additional reasons, beyond the reasons given above for its base claim 13.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Reply, Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing or a credit card payment form being unsigned, providing incorrect information resulting in a rejected credit card transaction, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date _____July 7, 2008_____   By _____*Phillip J. Articola*_____

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6014
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

George C. Beck
Registration No. 38,072

Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819

-7-